S.P. T.R. 57 186

centuries. However, formerly the conflict between the Great Russians and the Ukrainians, did not exist in its present day sense. On the contrary, the two parts had a sense of kinship, or even of unity, as may be seen in an examination of the motives for which Bohdan Khmelnitskyj gave himself to Moscow and to Tsar Alexis Mikhailovich (in 1653), after detaching the Ukraine from Poland.

S.P. T.R. 57 668

The conflict[1] between the two Russian nations did not in fact break out until the Nineteenth Century.

Its basic causes were:

1. The efforts of the Ukrainians to create or to revive a language and a literature of their own.

2. A whole series of scientific discussions upon the question as to what were the connections between the Great Russians and the Ukrainians, especially from a linguistic and an anthropological viewpoint.

Finally and above all:

3. The actual political and social status of the Ukrainians in the Empire and the general development in these latter years of social and democratic ideas.

/53/ Thus today the conflict is moving more and more from the literary and scientific field into the political field.

S.P. T.R. 57 668 538

The conflict began in 1798, when J.P. Kotljarevs'kji published in Ukrainian his Aeneid. From that date on there has been a great effort to create an indigenous literature. But these tendencies were quickly opposed by the government, which feared that this literary separatism might be prejudicial to national unity. And upon various occasions, especially in 1847, 1863, and 1876, it was forbidden to print or publish, save for a few rare exceptions, books in Ukrainian. But the result of these prohibitions was completely opposite from that which was intended. The tendencies toward literary emancipation asserted themselves so much the more strongly as they were more rigorously suppressed, and they found favorable soil in eastern Galicia, which belongs, as we know, to Austria.

5.P. T.R. 197 314 829

On the other hand, the conflict,[1] strengthened by the scientific discussions concerning the ties between the two nations, became aggravated. There were arguments about the antiquity of the Ukrainian idiom, especially in the Kiyev region, about the question of

1 [Between Great Russians and Ukrainians, et. al. 1163 pp. 35-37. Ans. -]

1: Niederle--38 E-5 1911 E16 Slavic Peoples E 1C
Tsarist Russia R2.
S.P. T.R. 197 814 829

determining who had produced the earliest Russian annals and the first Russian literature in the State of Kiyev. These polemics took place especially between 1850 and 1860; they were marked by the works of Sreznevskii, of Lavrovskii, and particularly of Pogodin, who pretended to demonstrate that up to the fourteenth century /54/ Kiyev had been occupied by the Great Russians, the initiators of the history and the literature of the region, and that the Ukrainians had not come from the Carpathians until after the Tatar conquest. This theory found opponents among the historians of the Ukraine; it was revived later with much greater energy (in 1883) from a linguistic point of view by Sobolevskii, and refuted with no less vigor by the historians Dashkevich, Antonovitch, Grouchevsky, A. Iablononskii, and the philologists V. Jagić, A. Shakhmatov, A. Krymskyj, A. Kolessa, A. Loboda, etc.

Naturally, no one limited himself to the question of discovering when the Ukrainians first settled in Kiyev. They also studied the degrees of kinship of the two idioms. Was there only a single Russian language with two dialects, or must two different languages be recognized? These debates, in which the principal Russian and Slavic philologists participated, oddly favored the theory which tended to separate the two groups and to widen the chasm which was being dug between them.

T.R. S.P. 814 829

But these theoretical polemics were not confined to the linguistics with which they dealt more and more frequently, and with a constant recourse to scholarly apparatus. Maksimovich had already declared that not only two languages, but two national types must be recognized in Russia; but he did not clearly formulate his doctrine. It was Kostomarov who ventured to do this and /55/ who produced a veritable revolution. He was followed by an entire series of anthropologists.

Maksimovich had not succeeded in formulating a precise distinction: Kostomarov succeeded in this in the article entitled: "The two Russian nationalities" published by the review Osnova (the Basis) in 1861. In this he pointed out the differences of history, of language, of customs, of character, of physical appearance, and he laid down this theory: that there are not only two Russian languages, but also two nationalities which differ completely the one from the other, and which history alone has united into a single unit.

This theory of Kostomarov had great success; it was developed

1: Niederle--39 E-5 1911 Slavic Peoples E/C
Tsarist Russia R2

S.P. T.R. 814 829

and led to the following conclusion: Of the two nationalities only one, that of the Ukrainians, is purely Slav; the peoples who live to the north and to the east of the Dvina and the Dnepr are not Slavs, but Finns, Tatars, or Turani more or less affected by Slavic influences, whose entire organization, and whose absolutist government in particular, are Asiatic in origin and character.

This conclusion, which the inventors of the theory of the two nationalities had scarcely suspected, found favorable soil, in particular among the Polish victims of the ill-omened revolution of 1863. And it was through their emigration that the doctrine of the two Russias, the one Slavic, the other Turanian, was propagated. Among the propagators of this doctrine, let us mention only the /56/ names of Dushinskii and of his wife Severina Duchinska, of Buszczynski and of the French historian Henri Martin. (1)

1. Several times I have had the opportunity of expressing myself on these theories and on the misuse which Dushinskii and his disciples claim has been made of them. See especially La Revue des Cours letteraires (year 1868) and my Souvenirs d'um Slavophile (pp. 20-25, Paris, Hachette, 1905). Translator.

This theory did not find as favorable soil among the Ukrainians; but it has been accepted in various ways, and it explains to us the epithet, Khazars, (2) which is sometimes given to the Great Russians;

S.P. T.R. [186]

2. The Khazars, formerly Kozares, a Scythian people according to the Russian Chronicle said to be by Nestor. See my translation of this chronicle (page 325). Translator.

this epithet apparently came from completely inaccurate ideas as to the origin of the Great Russians. The anthropologists have treated the question in a more scientific manner by indicating the considerable differences which exist between the Great Russians and the Ukrainians. The Ukrainians are for the most part brachycephalic and of dark complexion, while the Great Russians are generally of light complexion; at the same time it is demonstrated that dark brachycephalic type is the pure Slavic type (Volkov, Taylor). But this theory, although it has a certain amount of data in its favor, cannot be considered as proven. There is another one, which considers the Belorussian and Great Russian type as the true type of the Slavs; and this theory has in its favor at least as many arguments to /57/ make it worthy of belief. And the differences that arise within each of the two groups

S.P. T.R. 144 829

1: Niederle--54 E-5 1911 E16 Slavic Peoples E16
Poland EA1

S.P. P. 871 212

Polish women), despite all of the ill will of the government, are better educated than the Russians. Among the Russians there have been found 29.50% of the men and 9.34% of the women who are literate. Among the Poles the proportions are 34.78% and 29.40%.

S.P. P. 101 ●814

S 14. Differentiation.---We find also among the Poles rather considerable internal differences; but these are not reasons for dividing the nation into various nationalities. Moreover, the question has not been studied sufficiently, and not enough attention has been paid to it to enable one to distinguish from a scientific point of view the various Polish groups. Much material has been gathered together, especially, from the point of view of folklore, by Oscar Kolberg, more recently by Jan Karlowicz and others, in the review Wisla (The Vistula), and from an anthropological viewpoint by J. Majer, K. Kopernicki, I. Talko-Hrynczewicz, W. Olechnowicz, L. Rutkowski, A. Zakrzewski. The field of linguistics has been studied in recent times /83/ by St. Dobrzycki, J. Karlowicz and K. Nitsch, but up until the present these researches have not been gathered together and digested in a single study. The customary division into large and small groups is above all based upon historic tradition; a more scientific division will be a task for the future. The Polish nation is generally divided into the following groups:

S.P. P. 101

1. The Great-Polish group occupies Silesia, Poznan, and Prussia;
2. The Mazovian group lives to the east of the preceding one in the basins of the Vistula, of the Narew, and of the Bug;
3. The Little-Polish group is settled to the south on the upper Vistula, as far as the Carpathians and the San;
4. A fourth group is formed by the Kashub on the shore of the Baltic.

The Great-Polish group was the first to serve as a rallying point for the ancient tribes, evidently under the pressure of the German race, and its language has become dominant; it is the one which constitutes the local idiom.

On the contrary, Mazovia and Little-Poland, regions which were forested and less accessible, have retained more originality and local character.

Taking into account the names by which the people distinguish the tribes and the regions, the Polish ethnographers--Karlowicz, for example--distinguished particularly the following tribes:

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

V

Foundations of Russian Culture

175* 177 Russia makes a relatively late appearance on the stage of European civilization. A specifically Russian culture does not even begin until nearly 1000 A.D. with the conversion of Prince Vladimir I of Kiev in 989. In Western Europe, since the fall of the Roman Empire, a new civilization had by that time evolved from a fusion of Christian ideals with the survivals of classical culture. But medieval Russia derived its faith from Byzantium and from the Eastern branch of the church in which purely Latin culture played a subordinate role, since the dominant elements of Byzantine civilization were Hellenistic and oriental. The tradition of classical Latin culture, the influence of which never died out in Western Europe, was but one of the intellectual factors to which Russia was not exposed until its contact with the West was intensified by Peter the Great at the beginning of the eighteenth century.

178 ● 814 Another vital agent in Western civilization which never touched Russia directly was the complex of humanistic and renaissance ideals both in life and in literature. During the fourteenth century when the rising tide of humanism in Western Europe had revived the study of philosophy, politics, and science on the basis of classical sources, and when a fresh aesthetic pleasure was found not only in the imitation and the study of the ancients but also in the creation of new and popu-

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

lar forms in vernacular letters, Russia was just recovering from the economically destructive and intellectually paralyzing effects of the Tartar conquest which had weighed the nation down since 1240. Medieval Moscow had nothing of the thirst for knowledge and the ambition for culture that inspired the foundation of German universities during the last half of the fourteenth century. It lacked the close contacts with Italy of the sixteenth which meant for Western Europe the infusion of art into literature and bore fruit in France in the works of Ronsard and the Pléiade or in England in the brilliance of Spenser and Sidney. This heritage was transmitted to Russia only in the eighteenth century as an element in the literary models and traditions then taken over bodily from the West.

Apart from the classical tradition of the Middle Ages and the revival of intellectual and artistic creative fervor during the Renaissance, there was a third important element in Western culture to which Russia was not directly exposed: the spirit of the Protestant Reformation. Russia had received the Christian faith from Byzantium. But the Eastern Orthodox and the Western Roman Catholic Churches were split by the schism of 1054, sixty-five years after the conversion of Kiev. The Eastern Church intensified its emphasis on mysticism and asceticism without the balance of social and cultural interests which fertilized the labors of the Roman Church in Western Europe. Then, after the contacts between the Russian Church and Constantinople became difficult because of precarious communication, and still more after the fall of the Byzantine Empire fifty years before Columbus discovered America, the church in Russia became petrified in dogma and sunk in debased formalism. It maintained no such tradition of learning, no such cult of scholastic philosophy as made the Roman Church a nucleus of productive thought even in those periods of European political history in which popular culture was at its lowest ebb. It was incapable of producing such bold and independent thinkers as a Wyclif, a Hus, a Luther, or a Calvin. Indeed, had such thinkers arisen, it is doubtful whether, even in the church or

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

invaders as they fused with the native stocks, the Eastern Empire had grafted upon the legacy of Rome the picturesque and flamboyant features of oriental Christianity. Its autocratic sovereigns were the agents of God on earth under a system which combined in them the attributes of emperor and pope, and this factor ought especially to be borne in mind, because it not only explains the autocratic tradition later set up by the princes of Moscow but also lies at the root of the Russian tendency to attribute to all their rulers a sort of superhuman status. The superlative adulation showered on Joseph Stalin in our own day is in part a remote reflex of Byzantine influence. Then too, Constantinople before the arrival of the Crusaders was the greatest center of material civilization in the occidental world. Its buildings rivaled Rome in its prime. Its highly organized and stratified society, the splendor of its religious observances, its military prowess under the more gifted emperors, and its general atmosphere of wealth could not fail to create a lasting impression on visitors from less advanced regions.

But Byzantine civilization lacked the punch and the drive which characterized the best days of the Roman Empire or the realm of Charlemagne. In intellectual and literary matters the Eastern Empire was conservative. It studied the past without rivaling it with the products of contemporary creative imagination. It was compilatory rather than original. Byzantine scholars were the most learned men of their day, but their learning was accumulative, not productive. Byzantine historians composed voluminous chronicles without evolving a philosophy of history, while Byzantine theologians dissipated their energy on amenities of dogma argued with a bitterness which we should nowadays associate only with partisan politics. The Byzantine Church was more political than the Roman, more closely affiliated with the state, and hence less fundamentally spiritual in outlook. The literary tradition transmitted by the Byzantine Church was stiff and formalistic. and it was the misfortune of medieval Russia that the Byzantine influence was weakened by political events before it was absorbed by the

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

younger state in a volume which might have served as a firm basis for the development of a characteristic native culture. The Russians before the Tartar invasion were always pupils; they originated very little that was independent of Byzantine models either in literature or in art.

In art, however, this imitation was productive and created an architectural and a decorative tradition which lasted down into modern times. By the date of Vladimir's conversion, the basilica as a type of church architecture in Byzantium had been largely replaced by the cruciform church with one or with five cupolas. This was the type transmitted to Russia and still worthily represented by the great medieval churches of Kiev, Novgorod, Vladimir and even Moscow, though in the metropolis the more exotic forms and the onion-shaped dome derived from wooden architecture prevail. The highly conventionalized art of the icon dominated Russian painting until Western influences began to seep in during the seventeenth century, but this tradition was still vital enough before the first World War to influence the art of nineteenth-century religious and historical painters. For where the Byzantine tradition had taken firm root, the aesthetic appeal was long-lived and enduring.

In literature, along with lapidary works of religious implication, the Russian national spirit began to manifest itself in historical compilations during the eleventh century, and literary reflexes of folk poetry had already appeared before the Tartar conquest. But a truly national literature stems from a long educative process, and this process was interrupted in medieval Russia both by domestic politics and by nomadic inroads.

Where domestic disorders merely retarded the intellectual advance of medieval Russia, the Tartar incursion brought it to a full stop. It has already been noticed what material impoverishment it had caused. But the Tartar domination was a far more serious factor in the deterioration of cultural and spiritual values. The church, to be sure, was treated with tolerance by the Tartars because it preached submission to

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

Russian poets with more form than talent now began to celebrate official occasions and generous donors with ponderous odes. Handbooks of French pseudoclassic literary theory, like Boileau's *Art Poétique*, were translated and annotated. The Academy of Sciences, founded by Peter's widow in 1725, included not only imported German luminaries, but the first Russian natural scientist Michael Lomonosov, sometimes characterized as the Russian Franklin, but whom, on account of the universality of his talent, Pushkin, greatest of Russian poets, called "Russia's first university." He is also notable as the first proletarian in secular Russian letters, for he started his career as a poor fisherman's son far north on the White Sea. The first modern Russian history was composed during the reigns of Anna and Elizabeth by Basil Tatishchev, a former collaborator of Peter the Great. The purely intellectual progress in the thirty years after Peter's death was thus considerable, even though (with rare exceptions) it was confined to the aristocracy.

It is a matter of record that when Catherine II came to the throne in 1762 she was already familiar with the theories of the eighteenth-century French political philosophers and would have welcomed an opportunity to apply them. But her position had been won wholly by the aid of the landed gentry and the aristocratic guard regiments, who were unlikely to surrender any of their prerogatives or to consent to any mitigation of the institution of serfdom on which their economic existence was based. The great empress thus contributed little to social progress, and her educational innovations remained for the most part on paper. Yet through her interest in the satirical journal and in the drama, she stimulated the progress of Russian letters even if her social initiatives were weak. In that field others carried the torch. A Russian customs official, Alexander Radishchev, who had studied at Leipzig and digested the liberal philosophy of the day, in 1780 fired the opening gun against serfdom, and though the exploit sent him to Siberia, its echoes did not die away until the institution was abolished. At the same time, the spirit of social service inspired

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

and industry by German immigrants to Bohemia and Poland require no demonstration. By virtue of its close political association with western Europe, Bohemia was speedily drawn into European intellectual life, and as early as the thirteenth century Bohemian authors were reproducing in their own language the forms and content of German medieval literature. International culture was still more widely disseminated after the foundation of the University of Prague in 1348, and the Hussite movement produced a wave of intellectual activity which lasted until the Thirty Years' War in the seventeenth century.

Poland, because of its comparative remoteness and political instability, was not subject to the same cultural stimuli, and the services rendered by the German settlers in Polish territory were exclusively practical and materialistic. The influence of the Polish crown was never strong enough, nor were its holders cultured enough, to exert a civilizing influence comparable to that which radiated from Prague. Only in the sixteenth century do we meet with a striking development of Polish literature, and here the productive influences were more those of the Renaissance than specifically German, especially since local education was dominated by the Jesuits and strictly limited to the classical curriculum. While German economic influence was strong in both the great western Slavic states, it was Bohemia which profited the most from the absorption of German culture, and it was not until the seventeenth century that political events halted the intellectual advance so auspiciously begun.

Yet it was in Bohemia that the first seeds of a new Slavic racial consciousness sprouted early in the nineteenth century. The age of enlightenment had emphasized the ideals of humanity, tolerance, and culture, and these ideals were spread throughout the Austro-Hungarian monarchy by the reforms of Joseph II. As a matter of fact, the principle of nationality was first formulated by a German, for it was Goethe's great friend and mentor Johann Gottfried Herder, who declared that "the

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

most natural state is a state inhabited by a single nation with a single national character." This principle provoked a grateful echo in the minds of several outstanding Bohemian scholars and patriots. An ex-Jesuit, Joseph Dubrovski, the founder of Slavic philology as a discipline, was the first modern Bohemian patriot of nationalistic stamp, and his works gave to the whole Bohemian literary movement a pan-Slavist direction. He condemned Germanization, but not the Germans, and sincerely believed the Slavs destined to become the bearers of a new civilization. Through Dubrovski, the Czechs began to feel themselves a part of the great Slavic community, and expected to find support for their national aspirations in the new conception of a Slavic civilization.

Contemporary with Dubrovski (who died in 1839) was Joseph Jungmann, translator of *Paradise Lost* and of Châteaubriand's *Atala* who, by his compilation of the first Czech dictionary, revealed the wealth of the mother tongue and by his studies in literary history disclosed the richness and diversity of prior Bohemian literature. Dubrovski's work was carried on by the great antiquarian Paul Joseph Šafařík, a Slovak by birth, whose studies of the origins and expansion of the Slavs constitute a brilliant apologia for the Slavic nations. What Šafařík accomplished in the broad field of philology was duplicated in history by his younger Bohemian colleague, Francis Palacký, and these patriotic and scholarly efforts laid the foundations for a renaissance of Bohemian literature and of general Slavic intellectual life. The first models of the new literature were the products of the romantic movement in German letters, but Bohemian authors soon passed on to independent creation, and it was Joseph Kollár who, animated by his contacts at Jena with the literature of Young Germany, composed eloquent sonnets in which he called the scattered Slavs to solidarity and coöperation in the great work which he, as a disciple of Herder, believed was their destiny. In particular, Kollár preached a community of interests with the South Slavs, a principle which, had it been properly appreciated by

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

the Austrian authorities, might have had incalculable consequences for the maintenance of their Empire.

The ideals preached by Palacký, who was as great a journalist as he was a historian, were first formulated in political terms just prior to the revolutionary year 1848, which signalized the end of Metternich's regime and the dawn of constitutionalism in Austria. It was thus Palacký who advocated an autonomous Bohemia including all the lands which had formerly belonged to the Bohemian crown, together with as much of Hungary as was populated by Slovaks: the principle, indeed, upon which the Czechoslovak state was subsequently erected. It is significant, moreover, that the German elements in Bohemia were inclined to support the Czechs in their agitation for autonomy. But the federal idea was never realized in Austria-Hungary before the monarchy dissolved in 1918, and Bohemian hopes in this direction were dashed by the Austrian Constitution of 1867, which gave the Hungarians a preferred position, as compared with the Slavs, by establishing the principle of dualism, by making Hungary practically autonomous, and by settling the Magyar domination upon Slovaks and Croats. This loss was to some extent offset by educational concessions to the Czechs, since in the previous twenty years Bohemian national consciousness had consolidated to an extraordinary degree through the increased use of the native language and the improved status of both peasants and the middle class. The romantic emphasis laid by Palacký on the glorious past of Bohemia thus proved an altogether healthy spur to the national ambition.

Though after 1867 there was never any real reconciliation between Prague and Vienna, the material prosperity of Bohemia advanced rapidly in the next fifty years, and the part still played by the German element in Bohemia before the war of 1914 is evidenced by the fact that, though they comprised only 37 per cent of the population, they paid 50 per cent of the taxes. But while the Czechs never lost sight of the federalist ideal, this principle was looked on with disfavor by the Viennese

6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

to add that, from the last quarter of the nineteenth century up to the Sarajevo outrage, Slavonic problems were localised in the Balkans, and that this did not help to facilitate their understanding, nor to procure for them an impartial judgement? 186* 829 208

European 'volcano,' or 'rheumatism,' 'nest of vipers'—day in, day out, metaphors such as these flowed from the pens of our propagandists and diplomats when they were reviewing Balkan politics, because they were not prepared to admit that the crises in which these politics involved Europe were simply the repercussions of rivalry and scheming among the Great Powers.

If we leave diplomatic and political circles and pass to the public at large, we find that the word 'Slav' aroused more distrust than curiosity. For some people, it smacked of Nihilism or of Revolution; for others (forgetting that more than a quarter of the Slavonic world is Catholic) it held a menace to the unity of the Church. Slav refugees had fought on all the barricades during the nineteenth century; their names figured largely in the police alien records. In short, this word 'Slavism' suggested a set of psychological characteristics, rather than a geographical or national reality, and these characteristics—or their interpretation—made up a picture which the average Frenchman did not find very reassuring for Latin civilisation.

Whereas the political world adopted the caricature of Slavism outlined by the diplomats of the Ballplatz, the intellectual world, in its turn, often fell under German influence when dealing with the problems of Slavonic life. There was, in France, especially after 1870, a brilliant school of Slavicisers, who had studied the question on the spot. But for a long time it was restricted to a small number of enthusiasts, who lacked a sufficiently numerous audience to popularise their teaching. [814] •

Moreover, the early history of this teaching was unfortunate. The first holder of the Chair 'of Slavonic Language and Literature' at the *Collège de France* was Poland's most celebrated poet, Adam Mickiewicz. He was denounced to the Senate as a 'Panslavist'—a vague, but serious offence. For the time being, a well-chosen plural was sufficient to remove this offence: the chair changed its title and became the 'Chair of Languages and Literatures of Slavonic Origin'. Later on, however, Mickiewicz, accused of exaggerated mysticism and eccentricity, was obliged to give up lecturing altogether. The fate 186* 558

6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

186* 558 of his successor, Cyprien Robert, from Anjou, was scarcely less romantic. After the 1848 rising he was suspected of having left for America, with the followers of Cabet, in search of Icaria. This sufficed to give credence to the idea that Slavology tends to unbalance those who profess it.

186* 814 With Louis Léger, it is true, this science found its equilibrium and its discipline. But under Léger's guidance, Slavonic research tended to centre around Philology, and this orientation seems to have been permanent. The instruction gained in solidity what it lost in breadth; its beneficiaries, necessarily restricted in number, have never succeeded in forming a political team of Slavicisers such as would have given our diplomacy the orientation it lacked at the time of the two great crises of the present century.

Apart from what we may call Germanic interference, the Slavs have done a great deal towards helping to obscure or to emphasise their own characteristic features. What chance was there, in the past, of forming impartial ideas about the Russians from Polish testimony, or vice versa? About the Czechs, from Russian testimony? Or about the Catholic Slavs, from the testimony of the Orthodox? Outside an *élite* of thinkers, poets, scholars, who were the promoters and leading spirits of Slavonic Congresses, there was, between these nations, presumed to be of the same stock, nothing but rivalry, quarrels, and mistrust—piously encouraged, moreover, by their powerful neighbours. Denominational differences were stronger than race-solidarity; the Moujik felt that a Rumanian who made his sign of the cross with three fingers was nearer to him than the Slovak or the Croat who made his with his whole hand, or than the Czech philosopher, persecuted by the Austrian authorities as a 'dangerous Panslavist'.

[177] The inter-penetration of the different sections of Slavonic culture was so little developed that the great Russian poet, Pushkin, was deceived by Mérimée's literary hoax, when the latter published, under the title of *Guzla,* a so-called translation of Dalmatian songs.

186* 538 When Russian literature was revealed to the West, the latter greeted it with a defiant, or perverse, curiosity. *Monstrum invenimus.* French scholars saw in it less a new philosophy of life than an intellectual or sentimental pathology. De Voguë, who introduced the Russian novel into France, warned his readers

St Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

186* Russia to the Court of Versailles. This belongs to the prolific family of apocryphal documents in which the presumed projects of deceased monarchs have found an imaginary embodiment. But this forgery has often been invoked as an argument in favour of the existence of 'Panslavism'. Now, it does contain a programme of Russian expansion, and allusions to the Balkan Christians, but nothing more specifically affecting the Slavs. Which proves, at the very least, that his own contemporaries did not regard the founder of Modern Russia as the instigator of a policy of Slav solidarity.

186* 175 648 Under Catharine, every war against the Ottoman Empire was the occasion of levies of Slav contingents. After the failure of their risings, large bodies of Slavs took refuge in the South of Russia, where vast districts were allotted to them. During the Napoleonic wars, Admiral Seniavin's fleet, at the Cattaro Delta, assisted the combined Montenegrins and Serbs. But, at the Congress of Vienna, a failure on the part of Russian diplomacy caused the Cattaro Delta to be handed back to the Austrians. It was alleged that Alexander I had agreed to this betrayal of the Slavs, as the price of a night spent with the beautiful Madame de Metternich. Notwithstanding, Suvorov's victories prepared the way for the Serbian insurrection; when this broke out, the Russian general, O'Rurck, joined Karageorge, to beat the Turkish army at Varvarino, to the north of Nish.

Up to the nineteenth century, the Empire of the Tsars remained aloof from the European concert. When it did join in, through the expedient of the Holy Alliance, it espoused interests which were not its own, and for which, moreover, it showed little concern, by backing up the Balkan risings. In this way it tried its utmost to sponsor solidarity among the absolutist régimes, while at the same time supporting the Orthodox minorities.

186* 178 814 But the movement whose watchword was defence of 'brothers in race', did not arise in official circles. It was a creation of the 'intelligentsia'. It received its first impetus from the immense work of the German historical school in the second third of the nineteenth century. 'Sanctus amor patriae dat animum', the epigraph to the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, inspired Chafarik's *Slavonic Antiquities* in 1837, and Palatsky's *History of Bohemia*. The Slavs threw themselves passionately into these

6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

studies, and allowed themselves to be infected with that racial pride which German science displayed, with a tremendous orgy of texts and compilations.

Kollár, a Slovak, Koukouljevich, a Croat, Kopitar and Stanko Vraz, two Slovenes, with Vuk Karajich, a Serb, formed the pleiad of romantic scholars and men of letters who revealed to the Slav peoples the common basis of their culture and their traditions. Their scientific offensive, which Renan was to call, somewhat disdainfully, 'Comparative Philology transplanted to the political domain', was the prelude to an era of ferment, when far-seeing minds could foretell the catastrophe which would abolish the work of the Congress of Vienna. Never had pure learning let loose such a storm. It was destined to pile up, under the throne of the Habsburgs, the explosive forces whose work of destruction has been completed under our eyes.

The movement was precipitated by the recrudescence of racial antagonism in Hungary. The 1848 Revolution had scattered powder-trails throughout Europe. Austria-Hungary found herself, in the years that followed, a prey to two opposing currents, representing the different life-aspirations, rather than political conceptions, of two enemy groups among the nations of this heterogeneous Empire. While the Liberals of Vienna, in revolt against absolute power, marched in unison with the Frankfurt Parliament, and included in their ranks the Germans of Austria; while the Magyar Liberals broke with the Habsburgs and bore Kossuth to power, the Slavs of Cis-Leithania and Trans-Leithania, by a repercussion natural to oppressed races, rebelled against tendencies aiming at the strengthening of the two hegemonies, Germanic and Magyar. The ethnical crisis attained its peak in Hungary, where the Croats marched to the defence of the throne under the leadership of the Ban of Croatia, Jellachich, while the Slavs of Hungary (Slovaks and Serbs) kicked against the persecutions of a régime which Western journalism confused with Parliamentary Liberalism. Russia intervened in 1849 not only, as was long believed, to save the monarchical principle, but also under moral obligation not to let the Slavs of Hungary succumb. By the victory of Vilagos, the Russian armies restored to the Habsburgs Hungary, which they were on the point of losing. Six years later Austria, by her anti-Russian attitude in the Crimean War, was, according to a famous

6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

186* In Russia, this same year 1942 saw an unprecedented output
• 814 of works on Slavonic history and philology. Nicolas Derjavin studied Slavonic palæology, Russo-Bulgarian intellectual relations, the origin and history of the Slavs up to the eleventh century. The literature and history of the Slavonic nations were included in the syllabus of the High Schools; a chair of Slavonic Philology was created in the University of Leningrad; in May, 1942 the chair of Slavistic in the University of Moscow became a 'centre of studies in the history of the Slavonic peoples and of their role in intellectual evolution and in progress'.

186 The Ethnographical Institute of the Academy of Sciences
608 undertook a huge investigation into the origin of the Slavonic
829 settlements. A Tass Agency communication of July 4, 1943, announced the first results of this inquiry; the Slavs were aboriginals, not invaders. Professor Gudaltov proved that they descended from tribes settled between the Elbe and the Vistula. He pointed out the direct relationship between the Scythians of the Dnieper and the Polanes who played a decisive role in the formation of the State of Kiev.

186 Literature, the theatre, the arts, vied with each other in
533 contributing to this revival of Slavonic spiritual life. An
536 exhibition of the theatrical art of the Slavonic nations was held in Moscow in July, 1942. Chebalin's *Slavonic Quartet* obtained the Stalin Prize in 1943. The Musicians' Congress, which met in Moscow in January, 1943, praised Victor Belyi's 'Slavonic Suite' (Hymn of Anger, Serbian Guerrilla, To Arms!), the libretto of which, borrowed from Serbian folklore literature, is the work of the Montenegrin poet, Radoul Stiyensky.

186* But the essential task remained a political one. Five com-
575 mittees were formed, for liaison with sympathisers in the allied
668 countries—Panslav Committee, Youth Committee, Committee of Savants, Feminine Committee, Jewish Committee. The Panslav Committee launched message after message to oppressed Slavs, insurgent Slavs, Slavs in exile. They received from the Yugoslav Vetché—a political organisation struggling with Tito for independence—a telegram thanking them for their assistance with a view to the establishment of a 'Democratic Yugoslavia, federal and equal in rights', which concluded as follows: 'Long live the fraternal solidarity of all the Slavs in the struggle against German Fascism!'

7; Lednicki S-4 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

186* 829 The final conclusion is that the "immense Russian power pushes ahead, it cannot be quieted, it constantly must look to new arenas for its activity. The Slavic conscience strongly awakens in Russia . . . and it can not longer allow its relative tribes to remain in serfdom and shame. . . . To make of the whole of Slavdom a base is the only natural goal of Russian policy."[24]

4. Danilevsky (1822-1885)

The most radical Russian formulation of the Panslavistic program in its two directions—Constantinople and the Western Slavs—unified by a violent anti-Europeanism, was given by N. Ya. Danilevsky whose book *Russia and Europe* appeared in its first edition in 1871 and in its second in 1888 with a preface by another Panslavist, N. Strakhov. I cannot quote here the five hundred pages of this book in which the most fantastic idealization of the Russian past is married to the most vehement disdain and hatred for Western Europe and finally organized into a cynical political theory whose aim is to elaborate a system which would secure to Russia 186* a permanent political supremacy in the world. Danilesvky's starting 829 point is the denial of the conception of humanity and civilization ●814 as a whole, to which he opposes a conception of struggle between different cultural historical types based mainly on language groupings.

[177 .81] This conception of cultural historical types deserves special attention. Danilevsky combined the theme of Hegel, according to which various nations appear in succession on the historical stage as consecutive and ever more complete incarnations of the universal spirit, with the idea of the German historian Rückert about the existence of separate cultural historical types. "For Danilevsky such a cultural historical type is realized by every tribe or every family of peoples characterized by a separate language or group of languages sufficiently near to each other . . . if that tribe or family of peoples is in general, by its spiritual disposition, capa-

[24] *Ibid.*, p. 158.

7: Lednicki S-4 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

ble of historical development and has already risen from infancy. 186*
However, not all nations are equally capable of historical de- 829
velopment. There are some whose destiny is to serve as ethno- 814
graphical material to other stronger and more stabilized nations. Those others are God's whips whose mission is to smash from the face of the earth the outlived cultures and nations. Danilevsky gives a series of historical cultural types: Egyptian, Chinese, Assyrian-Babylonian-Phoenician, Indian, Iranian, Hebrew, Greek, Roman, New Semitic, German-Roman or European, and finally Slavic with Russia at its head. Each of these types works out its own culture, and the principles of the civilization of one type are not transferred to another. Various types differ by the degree of versatility of their culture. Danilevsky sees four spheres of cultural-historical activity: the religious, the strictly cultural, the political, and the social-economic. No one of the listed cultural-historical types developed all of these four spheres of activity at once, with the exception of the Slavs and Russians, whose mission will be to accomplish a complete 'four-principled' culture."[25]

The road to that Russian predominance is a purely nationalistic 186*
one; and, neglecting any declamation on Russian religiosity and 829
other well known features of the Russian character as presented 668
in the writings of the Slavophils and abandoning all ideas about brotherhood and universal love, he brutally opens the door into the great future of Russia. Russia is destined for that future, but the road to it leads first of all to Constantinople and secondly to the emancipation of the Slavic nations. I shall not bring to the fore all his violent criticism applied to "rotten Europe." The Russian anti-Westernism here reached its climax. The book is supported by quasi-scientific arguments taken from anthropology, zoology, geology, geography, and the social sciences. It might be considered one of the most important scientific manifestos or rationalistic Panslavic theories. However, the most important implications of the book are, of course, the political ones. "Being

[25] Danilevsky, *op cit.*, and article by V. Myakotin on Danilevsky in *the Entsiklopedicheskii Slovar'*, T-A Granat, vol. 17, pp. 552-557.

7: Lednicki S-4 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

"An immense plain—the Scythian plain which you didn't like on my relief map, where it spreads out like an enormous spot, is not more pleasant in reality."[38]

Not less striking than his *Russian Geography* are his historical views and the formulation of the Russian mission which we find in his two French articles *Russia and Revolution* and *Rome and the Roman Question*, and in a large work which he was preparing — *Russia and the West*. In all these writings he draws an apocalyptic picture of the destruction of the Europe of Charlemagne, of the Europe of the Treaties of 1815, of the destruction of the Papacy, Catholicism, and Protestantism. He demands a definitive formation of a great Orthodox empire, "the legitimate empire of the East, which will be realized by the absorption of Austria by Russia and the 'return' (*sic!*) of Constantinople to Russia and by the union of the two churches." The conclusion of these events will be symbolized by the Russian tsar as the Orthodox emperor in Constantinople, as the master and protector of Italy and Rome, and by an Orthodox pope in Rome as a subject of the emperor.[39] In his article *Papacy and the Roman Question* he constantly attacks all kinds of "usurpatory" tendencies of Western thought and seems completely unaware of the fact that his own conception represents the most fantastic historical usurpation—although not at all unreal in the light of our days. This is the way in which he ends his article: "Permit me to recall in conclusion, an incident connected with the visit which the Emperor of Russia made to Rome in 1846. One may still remember perhaps the general emotion with which the Emperor was received upon his appearance in the Church of St. Peter,—this was the appearance of the Orthodox Emperor who returned to Rome after several centuries of absence—and the electric flash which went through the crowd when it saw him going to pray at the tombs of the apostles. This emotion was legitimate. The prostrated Emperor was not alone; all Russia was prostrated with him.

[38] Leshnev, *op. cit.*, p. 24.
[39] Pigarev, *op. cit.*, p. 196.
[Tyutchev--Analyst]

7: Lednicki S-4 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

Let us hope that he did not pray in vain before the holy relics!"[40] The *Revue des Deux Mondes* published this article and prefaced it with a small and rather melancholic note: "Charlemagne is no longer in Paris or in Aix-la-Chapelle, he is in Moscow or in St. Petersburg. And one must above all keep in mind the fact that the new Charlemagne coming to Rome clearly pretends to bring, as the former one, a great material power, but he has no intention of coming there to find a spiritual, a moral consecration of his power. Far from that; it is he who, so to say, comes to consecrate the papacy. . . ." "One might make many other reflections upon this subject, and give some peculiar details on the march of ideas in one part of Russian society, and show how the school which formerly had Monsieur de Maistre as its chief and which made its gospel from the doctrines of *Du Pape* arrived gradually, by a kind of national logic, to find that the real pope was the tsar."[41]

But what is especially striking here is that Tyutchev appeared able to marry in his thought and in his heart this conception of a Russian Charlemagne in Constantinople and Rome with his own formula of Russia, a land of "officers, barracks, *chin* and *knut*." Justly asks Lezhnev: "In the name of what is the 'humble Russia' to obtain 'the thunder of earth and sword of heaven?' . . ." "Tsarist Russia spreads like an enormous spot over the map of the world—this is Tyutchev's 'Russian geography'. . . . What is Russia promising to those innumerable nations which she intends to subdue? Nothing but the quietness of the cemetery or of a northern desert."[42] Indeed this whole transformation of "barracks" into St. Sophia and St. Peter is a terrible fairy tale and on this occasion Lezhnev says that the theocratic tiara suits Nicholas I as "a saddle a cow."[43] As we know there are some other candidates for the same saddle. In his poems launched against the Vatican Tyutchev attacks the Pope because of his "fatal word": "the freedom of conscience is delirium." And this was written by

[40] *Revue des Deux Mondes*, January 1, 1850, p. 133.
[41] *Op. cit.*, p. 118.
[42] A. Lezhnev, *Due Poets* . . . Gos. Izd., 1934, pp. 13-14.
[43] *Ibid.*, p. 15.

7; Lednicki S-4 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

186* 575 Almost at the same time there reappeared in Russia a spiritual, idealistic, mystic approach to the Slavophil conceptions. It was a kind of continuation of neo-Slavic trends. One may find in the writings of distinguished and honest politicians, poets and writers such as V. I. Ivanov, S. N. Bulgakov, and Prince E. N. Trubetskoy items connected with this idealism and mysticism. These trends reappeared during the War of 1914. They were preceded by the old Muscovite "Society of Slavic Reciprocity" which was a quite honorable institution and by the subsequent "Society of Slavic Culture" in which the progressive elements among Russian and Polish politicians and scholars met, such as Professor Korsh, Prince E. N. Trubetskoy, Alexander Lednicki, and some others. The aim of this society was to pacify inter-Slavic relations primarily by the help of cultural activities.[65]

186* Some of the Czechs belonging to the period preceding neo-Slavism, however, remained faithful to their pro-Russian feelings in face of the opposition of Palacký and Havliček. So Kollár, who even in his *Slávy Dcera* excluded Emilia Plater, the Polish heroine of 1830-31, from paradise "because this sister fought against brothers, a Slav girl against Slavs," and yet, as Kucharzewski observes, granted a place in that paradise to Suvorov and Nicholas I, behaved quite disgustingly at the Slavic Congress in Moscow in 1867, where in the absence of the Poles he did his best to please their Russian persecutors.[66]

186* ● 814 Thus the Bohemian Panslavism found practically no expression in the nineteenth century other than a purely scientific one—in the fields of Slavic archaeology, Slavic ethnography, Slavic philology, and Slavic history. I can devote no space to Slavic philology here, but I should like to stress the enormous achievements in this field of, besides the Czechs, Polish, Russian, and Serbian scholars, to whom should be added German, French, Italian, Eng-

[65] Details connected with neo-Slavism, with events preceding the First World War, the policy of Izvolsky, the activities of Count Bobrinskoy on one hand—and on the other, activities of people such as Dmowski among the Poles the attitude of the Ukrainians, and the situation in the Balkans preceding the War of 1914 may be found in Dr. Alfred Fischel's *Der Panslavismus bis zum Weltkrieg*, Berlin, 1919.

[66] Kucharzewski, *op. cit.*, vol. II, Warsaw, 1925, p. 308.

7: Lednicki S-4 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavic Peoples E16
Poland EA1

S.P 186* 814

lish, and recently American scholars.[67] From this point of view the Czechs might be considered those who prepared weapons for Panslavism. And even in our days the Czech scholars remain faithful to their conceptions of Slavic cultural unity. It should be stressed, however, that the most prominent advocate among the Western Slavs (with the exception of some Poles) was, as mentioned before, the Slovak Štur, who represents an integral Panslavism practically degenerating into Panrussianism.

10. Polish Reactions

P 186* 175 648

The fate of the Slavophil and Panslavistic conceptions among the Poles has not been simple. Without going too far into the past or refering to Boleslaw the Great in whose policy one may find some elements connected with our subject, I shall abandon the effort to find some manifestations of interest for the Slavs in early polish historians, such as Jan Dlugosz (fifteenth century), and leave aside some Polish plans for political union with Russia in the beginning of the seventeenth century.

A forecast of the full growth of Polish Slavophilism was contained in the interesting "Manifesto" of the Sandomierz confederation or "An Address to the Russian Nation," which was published about 1733, at the time when Poland's political power during the Northern War had begun to decline and Russia's to increase. In this manifesto the Poles, expressing in warm words their sympathy for the Russian nation's "yearning for liberty and freedom, and waiting for a favorable moment to abolish serfdom" "frankly encouraged" Russians "to rouse their knightly spirit." The manifesto stressed that the Polish country "wishes for nothing more than your progress and the freedom of the Russian nation."

[67] This information may be found in the studies on Slavic Philology of Jagić, Alexander Brückner, Frantsev, Mazon, Máchal, Lehr-Splawiński, W. Lednicki, A. P. Coleman, in different reviews such as *Archiv fur slawische Philologie, Revue des Etudes Slaves, Le Monde Slave, Swiat Slowiański, Przeglad Slowiański, Slavia, Slawische Rundschau, The Slavonic and East European Review,* and *The American Slavic and East European Review.*